

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung, for conducting a brief telephonic interview on August 8, 2005, to confirm that the Office Action dated May 9, 2005, is a non-final action.

Claims 1-7 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kuo (U.S. Patent No. 5,635,897) in view of Osborn (WO 98/42154). Applicants traverse this rejection. Neither Kuo nor Osborn, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all of the features recites in claim 1.

The telecommunication terminal recited in claim 1 comprises an audible alarm and an external signaling device wherein the external signaling device is cordlessly connected to the terminal. In this telecommunication terminal, only one of the audible alarm or the external signaling device is configured to signal in response to an external call. By configuring only one of the devices to signal a call, users are able to avoid confusion and to save power. As recited in claim 1, when the external signaling device is turned on, the audible device is turned off. While this configuration is ideal when the external device is functioning, it is not ideal when the external device is non-functional, as such a situation may lead to missed calls. Therefore, as recited in claim 1, the audible alarm device "is automatically configured to be turned on if the external signaling apparatus is not operational, the cordless communication link has been interrupted or a distance between the telecommunication terminal and the external signaling apparatus exceeds a defined value." By turning the audible device on when the external device is non-functional, calls will not be missed. Applicants note that turning the audible device "on" does not alarm the device or cause the device to signal, but instead configures the audible device to signal when an incoming call is received. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Kuo.

To the contrary, col. 4, lines 2-9, of Kuo disclose a device in which an alarm 308 is activated when a mobile phone 1 is removed a predetermined distance from a body device 2. Kuo

explains that this feature is designed so that users do not forget their mobile phones. In the device of Kuo, when the body device 2 is removed a certain distance from the mobile phone 1, the mobile phone 1 starts to alarm to allow a user to locate the mobile device and ensure that it is not forgotten. This feature does not in any way disclose or suggest configuring either device regarding the signaling of incoming calls. As further evidence of the lack of disclosure, both devices are always activated when a call is received. (As was previously conceded by the Examiner.)

Osborn, on the other hand, discloses an alerting system 12 that has a first unit 14 that is attached to a communication device 10 and a second unit 16 that can be worn by a user. Osborn discloses that the first unit 14 may be configured to silence the signaling of the communication device 10 when the alerting system 12 is powered on. However, while Osborn may disclose configuring only one device to signal, like Kuo, Osborn also fails to disclose or suggest that the signaling of the communication device be turned on when the second unit 16 is non-functional, when there is an interruption in the wireless signal between the first unit 14 and the second unit 16, or when the second unit 16 removed a certain distance from the first unit 14.

Accordingly neither Kuo nor Osborn, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable.


Claims 2-7 depend from allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief, including extensions of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 449122007100.

Dated: August 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Adam Keser

Registration No. 54,217  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7301